

**REMARKS**

Applicant appreciates the examiner's review of the present application. The enclosed amendments and remarks are in response to the office action mailed November 2, 2006 imposing a restriction requirement in the above identified application. The enclosed listing of claims replaces the listing of claims presently on file.

Initially, the examiner has issued a restriction between claims 1 through 23 drawn to a corneal inlay and claims 24 through 45 drawn to a method of implanting a corneal inlay. Applicant hereby elects group I, claims 1 through 23, drawn to a corneal inlay, without traverse.

Next, the examiner has stated that group I comprises three (3) species namely: species A embodied in claim 1; species B embodied in claim 17; and species C embodied in claim 20. Applicant hereby elects species A, embodied in claims 1 through 16, without traverse.

The examiner next goes on to state that with regard to the corneal inlay claims (group I, claims 1 through 23), there are some 22 different species, with no claim being generic. Applicant

In re: Gary M. Kawesch  
Filed: March 16, 2004  
Serial No.: 10/803,013  
Page 17

elects, with traverse, species A through F and M through S. Having previously elected to proceed with the corneal inlay claims 1 through 16 drawn to a corneal inlay with at least one protrusion extending downwardly from the bottom surface of the corneal inlay, applicant urges that all of the elected species referenced in this paragraph are drawn to such a corneal inlay and that claim 1 is generic to such corneal inlays.

The examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned, applicant's attorney of record, to facilitate advancement of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

Gary M. Kawesch

By



Daniel J. Bourque, Esq.  
Registration No. 35,457  
Attorney for Applicant(s)

BOURQUE & ASSOCIATES, P.A.  
835 Hanover Street, Suite 301  
Manchester, New Hampshire 03104

Telephone: (603) 623-5111  
Facsimile: (603) 624-1432

Date: 1-31-07